

**URBAN I  
COMMUNITY INITIATIVE  
PROGRAMME**

**Bristol  
United Kingdom**

**1997-1999 PROGRAMME**

ERDF No. 97.09.10.002

**ARINCO No. 97.UK.16.105**

**CLOSURE REPORT**

*Government Office for the South West  
2 Rivergate, Bristol*

*UNITED KINGDOM*

## CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
<b>REPORT AND ANNEX CONTENTS</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>OPERATIONAL CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>5</b>
	A1 Significant developments.....	5
	A2 Consequences of the developments.....	8
	A3 Observance of specific provisions.....	8
	A4 Integration with other Structural Funds.....	8
	A5 Coherence with Other Policies.....	9
<b>B</b>	<b>PROGRAMME ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>10</b>
	B1 Monitoring Committee.....	10
	B2 Modifications to financial tables.....	16
	B3 Modifications to management and monitoring systems.....	17
	B4 Use of Technical Assistance.....	17
	B5 Information and publicity.....	17
	B6 Observance of Community policies.....	18
<b>C</b>	<b>PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION.....</b>	<b>19</b>
	C1 Financial aspects.....	19
	C2 Implementation of the Programme measures.....	22
	C3 Analysis of achievements of the Programme overall.....	24
<b>D</b>	<b>EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>26</b>
	D1 General description of relevant programme evaluation.....	26
	D2 Synthesis of results.....	26
	D3 Proposals and recommendations resulting from evaluations.....	28
<b>E</b>	<b>CONTROL ACTIVITY.....</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>ANNEX A MEMBERSHIP OF THE PMC and UMC</b>	
	<b>ANNEX B PRACTITIONERS</b>	
	<b>ANNEX C PROJECT APPROVALS</b>	
	<b>ANNEX D PMC TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>	

## **INTRODUCTION**

This is the **Closure Report** for the Bristol URBAN I 1997-1999 Programme which operated from 10<sup>th</sup> January 1997 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 1999. The Programme was formally approved by the European Commission on 28<sup>th</sup> July 1997. The Closure Report presents the final Programme position in terms of its financial spend and its achievements.

The European URBAN Community Initiative was launched in 1994 in an effort to extend and improve co-ordination of local community support for the implementation of urban regeneration initiatives. URBAN seeks to address problems of lack of economic opportunity, low incomes and poor quality of life in disadvantaged urban areas, particularly among groups who have difficulty accessing mainstream regeneration programmes. It supports schemes for economic and social revitalisation and renovation of infrastructures and facilities, focusing particularly on promotion of equality of opportunity, tackling long-term unemployment and environmental improvement. The Programme area covered the inner city area of Bristol comprising St Paul's, Easton and Barton Hill, with a population of 17,000.

The European Commission Guidelines (96/C200/04) identified target URBAN areas as neighbourhoods in cities and urban agglomerations with a population of no more than 100,000, and which were experiencing high levels of unemployment, a decayed urban fabric, and poor housing and amenities.

The six key principles which URBAN programme submissions sought to include were:

- 1) Concentration on the worst-affected communities, and groups within these communities;
- 2) Complementarity with other European and domestic funding sources;
- 3) Integration with other policies which impact on the communities involved;
- 4) Achieving a catalytic effect by encouraging change in existing funding streams in order to achieve greater overall effectiveness;
- 5) The involvement of communities in the design, management and implementation of projects; and
- 6) An increased focus on the long-term process of economic and social integration through the development of an Action Plan.

The managing authority in the UK, the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR), stated that eligible measures were:

- Community capacity building and strategy development;
- Community and local business development;
- Provision of training and child-care facilities and resource centres;
- Community led environmental initiatives;
- Training and human resource development actions, including guidance and counselling.

In the UK, 20 URBAN I programmes were introduced in two phases, Round 1 and Round 2. The Bristol programme was introduced in Round 2. It was one of the four URBAN programmes not within an Objective 1 or an Objective 2 area.

The introduction of the unique feature of Action Planning under URBAN placed the emphasis on community led regeneration, and the establishment of community-led URBAN Partnership Groups (UPGs). Administrative arrangements were agreed between the UK-Government and the European Commission and were contained in each UK-URBAN Programme document. These were:

- the establishment of a UPG, including local community representatives, which is responsible for the day to day implementation of the Initiative including project selection, appraisal and approval below a set level of grant. The first task of the UPG was to develop an URBAN Action Plan which was to form the basis for the delivery of a genuinely bottom-up local economic strategy reflecting community needs;

- the appointment of a locally based Accountable Body to be financially accountable for expenditure; and
- an URBAN Management Committee, comprising all the main funding agencies, to endorse the Action Plan and ensure its ongoing review. The Management Committee also undertakes capacity-building actions in the absence of community structures.

Further details are presented in **Section B**.

The Bristol URBAN I Programme placed a particular emphasis on:

- The unemployed;
- Young people under the age of 25;
- Women and families with young children;
- Disabled people; and
- Black and other minority groups.

The overall aim of the Programme was:

***“The creation of sustainable economic growth through enhanced employment prospects and by strengthening the social fabric”***

To be achieved through:

*Creating new business and employment opportunities, offering goods and services locally and throughout the city, thus drawing wealth and investment into the area;*

*Involving the community and local organisations in developing capacity to address local issues and problems;*

*Developing employment and training initiatives linked to improved local services which will support residents during this regeneration process and beyond.*

The Bristol URBAN I Action Plan was formally approved by the DETR and Department for Education and Employment in May 1998, following approval by the Bristol Urban Programme Monitoring Committee on 28<sup>th</sup> March 1998.

## A OPERATIONAL CONTEXT

### A1 *Description of any significant developments in the socio-economic, political or legislative situation of the region*

#### Socio-Economic Developments

##### Overview

In general the 1990's were a time of economic growth in Bristol, the South West region and across the UK more generally. Claimant unemployment in the UK fell by close to 50% over the decade. Both the local and the national picture continued to improve throughout the implementation of the Bristol URBAN Programme. Indeed, over the Programme period 1997-2001 the city of Bristol was characterised as a boom city, experiencing rapid employment growth, particularly in business and financial services. In many ways, Bristol is a successful 'modern' city where growth is driven by the service economy and higher-level skilled research and development associated with successful clusters such as computing, aerospace.

The situation in the Bristol URBAN I area also improved over the period of the Programme's implementation, although the area remains deprived relative to the wider economy, and the URBAN I area has not significantly 'closed the gap' with regional and national trends against all indicators. Whilst deprivation in the target area has not been entirely alleviated, there are signs that the inner city communities are better placed to take advantage of the new opportunities arising in the wider economy.

##### Employment and Economic Activity

For Bristol as a whole, economic activity rates closed the gap with the regional average. The regional rate remained at 81.7% at the end of the Programme implementation period (end of 2001), the same as at the start of the period, whereas the rate in Bristol increased from 77.9% to 81.7% over this period. Data are not available for the exact-fit URBAN I area, but it is likely that economic activity rates improved in the target area, albeit from a lower base. Some of the increased economic activity in URBAN I, however, would have been a result of the general upturn in the wider economy.

##### Unemployment

Unemployment rates in the South West fell from 5.1% to 4.1% 1997-2000 and in GB from 6.4% to 5.4%. The reduction in the unemployment rate in the city of Bristol was even more rapid than for both the South West and GB, falling from 7.1% in 1997 to 4.9% in the city of Bristol. The figures are presented below.

<b>Trends in Key Indicators (%) 1997-2000*</b>			
	<b>City of Bristol</b>	<b>South West</b>	<b>GB</b>
ILO Unemployment Rate (16+) 1997	7.1	5.1	6.4
ILO Unemployment Rate (16+) 2000	4.9	4.1	5.4
<i>+/- percentage points</i>	<i>-2.2</i>	<i>-1.0</i>	<i>-1.0</i>

Source: Labour Force Survey; data is for final quarter 2000; \* no data comparisons across all three geographies available for 2001

The unemployment rate in the URBAN I area itself, however, was significantly higher at 26% at the start of the Programme (1996 figures), more than double the European average (11%) and almost four times the (1996) national rate of 7.6%.

The number of claimant unemployed fell considerably during the implementation period for Bristol URBAN I. In both the Ashley and the Easton wards, the number of persons unemployed and claiming benefit fell by more than 50%, a greater decline than the national average, although marginally behind the rate of decline in Bristol as a whole. However Lawrence Hill, the most deprived part of the target

area, experienced a slower rate of decline (37%) than either the city or national average, suggesting that the unemployment rate also widened between Lawrence Hill and the rest of the country.

<b>Unemployed Claimants 1997-2002, All Persons</b>				
	Jan 1997	Jan 1999	Jan 2002	% ch. 1997-2002
Ashley	1,373	939	666	-51.4
Easton	742	482	318	-57.1
Lawrence Hill	1,135	904	704	-37.9
<b>Bristol</b>	<b>15,744</b>	<b>9,766</b>	<b>6,654</b>	<b>-57.7</b>
<b>GB</b>	<b>1,823,275</b>	<b>1,318,990</b>	<b>971,840</b>	<b>-46.7</b>

#### Long-term unemployed

At the start of the Programme period, the target area also had a higher proportion of long-term unemployed claimants (as a proportion of all claimants) when compared to the national average. 62% of all claimants were long-term (more than 6 months) compared to 56% nationally. In each of the three wards into which URBAN I extended, the *proportion* of claimant unemployed who were unemployed for more than six months remained *largely unchanged*, and this is in contrast to the Bristol-wide and national pictures where long-term claimants as a proportion of the total fell dramatically. Again, this is unsurprising, given the particular problems in the URBAN I area, and it is likely that wider benefits of the Bristol URBAN I Programme will take longer to feed through into the data (in particular because the spend-profile in the area was towards the end of the Programme).

<b>Long-Term Unemployed Claimants as a % of all Claimants, 1997-2002, All Persons</b>				
	Jan 1997	Dec 1999	Jan 2002	+/- 1997-2002
Ashley	61.5	57.7	61.5	0
Easton	40.4	39.0	39.4	1
Lawrence Hill	38.1	38.3	33.6	4.5
<b>Bristol</b>	<b>55.7</b>	<b>37.3</b>	<b>30.3</b>	<b>25.4</b>
<b>GB</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>20.6</b>

#### Education

At the start of the Programme residents in the area were particularly disadvantaged in relation to educational performance: only 12% of pupils in local schools continued into full time education at 17; twice the national average were leaving the two secondary schools in the area with no GCSEs. The low level of qualifications contributed to the weaker economic performance in the target area, particularly in view of the recognised relationship between low skills and unemployment/low wages. The URBAN I Programme sought to address the issue of low skills in adults, through a number of ESF courses in the area, many linked to ERDF-supported projects.

#### Deprivation Indicators

The economic growth and prosperity in Bristol and the South West were not experienced in all areas, nor by all residents. As with a number of other urban areas in the UK during the late 1990's there remained an issue about the inclusiveness of economic growth. National UK policy developments (see below) saw the Social Inclusion Unit set up in response to these concerns. Many inner-city residents in Bristol in particular did not participate in the increased prosperity experienced by the majority. Areas such as inner-city Bristol have long suffered relative deprivation with lower wages and lower skills alongside higher levels of unemployment and higher benefit dependency despite successive regeneration efforts.

Given the long-term and entrenched nature of the difficulties facing URBAN areas, it is not surprising that the latest indices of deprivation (2000) indicate that the Bristol URBAN I area remains disadvantaged relative to other areas. Trends indicate the intransigence of improvements in performance of the poorest in society. Although the two deprivation indices are not directly comparable, the ranking of Easton improved from its 1998 ILD position of being in the worst 8% of wards in the country, however, on the 2000 IMD the ward remains in the worst 12%. In line with the

regional and national trends, unemployment rates in the URBAN I area fell considerably between 1997-1999, but at a much lower rate.

The South West region as a whole has a lower than average proportion of the population from ethnic minorities. This is in contrast to the Bristol URBAN I area where the proportion from ethnic minorities is 30% compared to 9% nationally. Indeed, one of the key characteristics of Bristol URBAN I was its racial mix and 'under-performing' ethnic minorities. The needs of ethnic minorities in the Bristol URBAN area were given particular attention.

### Summary

It is clear that there were considerable improvements at a national and regional level in overall economic performance over the years of the URBAN I Programme. The improvements in the city of Bristol were even more dramatic, with considerable levels of investment attracted to the city and many new employment opportunities created. The issue throughout the Programme's implementation, however, remained about helping those in the target area access employment opportunities, through giving them the right skills, by providing opportunities in the locality, through overcoming other access issues. The Bristol URBAN I Programme made considerable inroads, in particular in relation to improving the infrastructure to enable the community to help itself.

### Legislative Developments

#### **1997:**

Following their election victory in May 1997, the new Labour government established the agenda for the UK Government in the 1999 Cabinet Office White Paper *Modernising Government*. This established the Social Exclusion Unit specifically to address the needs of those outside of mainstream society and the labour market. Through Policy Action Teams, the Unit sought to bring a more collaborative and cross-departmental approach to tackling issues of social exclusion.

#### **1998:**

The Unit's initial report "Bringing Britain Together - a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal," paved the way for a range of initiatives to tackle deprivation, including the introduction of the New Deal for Communities in September 1998. Four main themes are identified: tackling worklessness; improving health; tackling crime; and raising educational achievement: many of the issues which characterise and typified the URBAN I areas.

The UK Government also started to implement its 'Welfare to Work agenda', which introduced the New Deal programme in April 1998, which offered training placements for those out of work and claiming benefit in return for a supplement to the benefit payment.

#### **1999:**

Overall UK policy to reduce social exclusion was incorporated in the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. The Strategy involves four main principles/areas of intervention: Reviving local economies; Reviving communities; Decent services; and Leadership and joint working. By the end of 1999, the Strategy was still under development, although it nonetheless promised to reflect the seriousness with which the UK Government was addressing the issue.

At a regional level, the principal development was the establishment in April 1999 of Regional Development Agencies in England. The RDAs are responsible for the preparation of Regional Economic Strategies, in partnership with other key stakeholders, as well as the activities of the former English Partnerships and the Rural Development Commission. Importantly in an area-based regeneration context, the RDAs also assumed responsibility for the Single Regeneration Budget, a key source of co-financing in URBAN areas. The RDAs have sought to bring a regional perspective to regeneration issues, where the contribution of local areas is seen within the wider context of the sub-region.

The other major UK policy development was the establishment of the Learning and Skills Councils, introduced by the 1999 White Paper "Learning to Succeed". The Learning and Skills Councils brought together the former Training and Enterprise Councils and the Further Education Colleges into one organisation. By the end of 1999 the LSCs were still embryonic and had not made a major impact on learning and training delivery. However, this was expected to change during 2000 and 2001 i.e. during the latter part of URBAN I Programme implementation.

#### **A2 Consequences of the above developments on the implementation of the Programme**

The improvements in the national economy were accompanied by improvements in the economic performance of the URBAN I areas. This is true for the Bristol URBAN I area where employment growth and the fall in unemployment rates have benefited the residents of the URBAN I area. A large number of jobs were created in the city of Bristol economy during 1997-2001, many in service occupations, and many URBAN I residents have taken up these employment opportunities in the wider economy. A significant proportion of the jobs created in Bristol have been in the city centre and are physically accessible to the URBAN residents.

Given the nature and scale of the problems in St. Paul's, Easton and Barton Hill at the start of the URBAN Programme, it is unrealistic to expect all the problems to be alleviated. Inner city areas are characterised by a relatively transient population, and many of those residents benefiting from better quality jobs and higher wages choose to leave the area for alternative accommodation. Whilst economic conditions improved in the Bristol URBAN I area, the core problems remained; reinforcing the validity of the URBAN I strategy and the concentration of resources through a bottom-up approach engaging the local communities.

The political and institutional changes affect the availability of match-funding, for example the scale of new SRB programmes. In practice, the new legislative arrangements did not directly impact on the delivery of URBAN during 1997-2001. By mid 1999, when the Regional Economic Strategies were being developed, the majority of the allocations to URBAN I had been committed. In effect, English Partnerships remained one of the key sources of funding for capital projects being worked up during the Programme period. Of more significance was the New Deal programme which provided match-funding to enable the URBAN I Programme to offer routes to employment via ESF.

As a consequence of the UK Government's recognition of the plight of the most disadvantaged communities, Barton Hill in the URBAN I Programme area was selected as a pilot area for New Deal for Communities. This brought new resources into the area; and the longer-term time horizons for New Deal for Communities (10 years) compared to URBAN resulted in some potential URBAN I projects being developed within the NDC framework (for example the JobLink project). Many of the objectives of NDC were compatible with those of URBAN.

#### **A3 Observance of any specific provisions concerning the implementation of the Programme agreed through the partnership during the negotiation of the document**

There were no specific provisions concerning the implementation of the Bristol URBAN I Programme.

#### **A4 Integration or complementarity with other Structural Funds, Community Initiatives, Community Loans (EIB) etc**

Alongside the 1997-1999 Bristol URBAN I Programme were both the South West of England Objective 3 1997-1999 and the regional Objective 4 Programmes for ESF. The URBAN I Programme, in contrast to the successor URBAN II Programmes, incorporated both ERDF and ESF funding streams. For ESF in URBAN I, the emphasis was on very targeted, specific training support, often *directly related to an ERDF project* in the target area (which can be regarded as one of the successes of the URBAN I Programme). Individuals and employees in the URBAN I area also had the opportunity to benefit from the Objective 3 and 4 ESF programmes to support specific groups of people.

ESF Objective 3 represented an average of £4.5m (ESF) of support in the (former) Avon sub-region (based on 2000 allocations), and supported circa 3,000 beneficiaries. A proportion of these beneficiaries will have come from the URBAN I area. Objective 3 provided upskilling for the unemployed encouraging them along 'Pathways to Employment'. ESF Objective 4 was a much smaller Programme, offering support to those in employment to develop their skills to benefit themselves and their business. Given the weak business base in the URBAN I target area (and the need for the SME to invest some of its own resources to support staff development) it is likely that the URBAN I area received less than its anticipated share of Objective 4 resources.

For the 1997-1999 Programme period, Bristol did not receive Objective 2 support, although parts of Bristol were incorporated within the South West Objective 2 Programme area for 2000-2006. During 1999, it was proposed that the URBAN I area be included within the Objective 2 Programme area, partly to reflect the long-term problems facing inner-city Bristol, and also in recognition that some of the URBAN I processes and activities developed could be 'mainstreamed' into the new Objective 2 Programme.

#### **A5 Coherence with other policies, sectorial, regional, national or European**

The Bristol URBAN I Programme operated within the context of city-wide (Bristol), South West regional, national and European policies and initiatives. The Programme sought to take advantage of the opportunity to focus and concentrate resources in a small, geographically targeted area, and to involve the full range of partners involved in the delivery of regeneration activity. The Programme sought to achieve its objectives of pioneering a community-led approach.

The move to intensive support in local areas was a reflection of the lessons learnt from previous initiatives that resources needed to be more concentrated on areas of greatest need. It built upon findings from the evaluations of the 1994-1996 Objective 2 Programmes regarding community economic development, which identified a need for more intensive resources, more capacity building to achieve sustainable economic development, more "joined up working" and more community ownership in the most disadvantaged areas within Objective 2 areas.

As stated, at a national level URBAN I was commensurate with the aims and objectives of the UK Government's Social Inclusion Unit and the aspirations of Neighbourhood Renewal. The selection of Barton Hill as a pilot for New Deal for Communities was an example of this. URBAN also reinforced some of the key approaches developed by the UK Single Regeneration Budget, which continued to operate throughout URBAN I Programme period. This included a cross-agency working approach to area-based initiatives (e.g. Department of Health, Home Office for crime, DTI for business).

The Bristol URBAN I Programme complemented two SRB programmes over the period 1997-1999. The Inner City Lifeline programme (SRB Round 2) commenced in 1998 and focused on parts of Easton ward. It is a seven-year programme addressing unemployment, community safety, housing, education and training. The Bridging the Gap four-year demonstration programme (SRB Round 3) commenced in 1999 to develop links between employers and communities through support, guidance, counselling, outreach services and accessible services.

Further, the Easton Renewal Area programme continued its ten-year programme of improvements to houses, shops, roads and to street lighting which began in 1993. 2,630 dwellings are covered by the initiative, some of which are in Lawrence Hill ward and part of the URBAN I area.

The operation of ERDF and ESF funds within the URBAN I area, i.e. where ESF-supported courses operated from ERDF-supported premises was a strong feature of the Bristol Programme. The close ERDF-ESF link improved the Programme's cohesion. This was further strengthened by the high levels of complementarity between URBAN I and other funding/regeneration initiatives in the area.

## **B PROGRAMME ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT**

### ***B1 Description of the Monitoring Committee's (and any sub-committees) activities, details of main decisions taken***

The Bristol URBAN I programme was managed by the Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC) and the URBAN Management Committee (UMC). The Membership and Terms of Reference for the PMC were approved on 27 March 1998. The initial membership (i.e. the organisations asked to submit candidates for inclusion in the Committee's membership) was agreed earlier in principle between Government Office for the South West, Bristol City Council, and with the European Commission.

In view of the tightly defined geographic area and the proposed functions of the two Committees, it was agreed that the PMC and UMC should meet as one Committee in this special case. This was agreed with the European Commission.

At an operational level, the Urban Partnership Group (UPG) was responsible for project approval, up to a delegated threshold of £100,000 revenue and £250,000 capital, from the 17<sup>th</sup> December 1998 onwards (see below). Prior to this, the project approval function rested with the PMC.

#### **Programme Monitoring Committee**

The first Committee was chaired by Matthew Quinn (Government Office for the South West). The full membership of the PMC is contained in **Annex A**.

#### ***PMC Meetings Held During 1997***

A preliminary meeting of a shadow PMC met on **3<sup>rd</sup> November 1997** to discuss the development of the URBAN I Programme document and possible administration and project appraisal systems.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> December 1997**

The PMC **approved** the project appraisal system and scoring criteria, subject to the inclusion of additional eligibility criteria on integration, and improving the weighting given to value for money.

The PMC **approved** projects for capacity building, and for the project development worker subject to changes in the funding structure.

The PMC **approved** the UPG Terms of Reference.

Following the first meeting of the PMC there was a long delay before the second meeting in March 1998. This reflected the time devoted to the development of the Action Plan.

#### ***PMC Meetings Held During 1998***

#### **27<sup>th</sup> March 1998**

The Action Plan (AP) was introduced and it was stated that the AP was regarded as acceptable by the Commission and endorsed by partners. Subject to minor changes and the condition that the UPG submit regular reports, adoption of the Action Plan was **agreed**.

The combining of the PMC and the UMC and its membership was **agreed** as per the recommendation of the European Commission Desk Officer, although it remained the intention of the Committee to increase the number of community group representatives on the UPG. The proposed amendments to the terms of reference to reflect the merger of the two groups were **agreed**, although a request was made that the link between the PMC and the UPG be made explicit.

A UPG progress report was given (see below).

It was raised that the possibility of an extension to the Programme be investigated (at the time the Leeds partnership had requested a six month ESF and twelve month ERDF extension).

It was **agreed** that a visit of projects by the Desk Officer, Peter Berkowitz, be arranged for a subsequent meeting.

### **21<sup>st</sup> May 1998**

At this meeting:

- Paul Owens, Community Development Worker was **appointed**.
- The decision to grant full delegation of project approvals to the UPG without PMC/UMC approval was **delayed until September**.
- The decision to request an extension to ESF projects was **delayed until September**, to enable a clearer picture of ESF take-up.
- A decision to make two places on the UMC/PMC available to UPG members, in addition to the current cross-membership **was agreed**, following the outcome from the capacity building exercise.

A UPG progress report was given (see below).

The UMC/PMC endorsed:

- The Bristol Foyer project, given the conditions highlighted by the UPGs assessor and the Secretariat -the project was above the UPG delegated threshold.
- The Bristol Care and Repair ESF project.

### **23<sup>rd</sup> July 1998**

It was **confirmed** that Bristol City Council would take on the role of the Accountable Body.

A UPG progress report was given (see below).

With respect to UPG Membership, the PMC/UMC were presented with a Paper designed to:

- Allow individuals to nominate alternates from within their organisation;
- Provide for further training;
- Allow for replacement members; and
- Address perceived weakness in representation from the community/private sectors.

It was suggested that the EC Desk Officer should be approached regarding the issue of full delegation to the UPG who were unwilling to accept this role. Others also expressed concern over the UPGs state of readiness.

It was **agreed** that a joint UPG/PMC/UMC meeting be held to discuss UPG membership, especially community representation.

Since projects coming to the PMC/UMC had not been checked by GOSW, the projects could only be granted in-principle support.

The PMC/UMC endorsed (subject to eligibility checks):

- The Fast Track project;
- The Capacity Building project;
- Growing Together;
- Easton Business Centre (outline support subject to full application).

### **20<sup>th</sup> August 1998 (Extra-ordinary Meeting)**

This meeting was held in response to the previous concerns raised over the balance of UPG membership, particularly the need for more residents to be represented and involved. The key issue being that committee members should represent residents and communities not just their organisation.

The UPG proposals were:

- 2 seats for Bristol City Council (one for Chair of the Committee for Equalities and Social Justice, and one seat shared by two ward councillors). The PMC/UMC **endorsed** this proposal.
- 1 seat for Bristol Regeneration Partnership. This was **endorsed**.
- 3 seats for key partners. Potential key partners would self-nominate. This was **endorsed**.
- 4 seats for community and voluntary organisations.
- 4 seats for residential groups, although this would take considerable capacity building. BCC tenant groups were regarded as a useful starting point.
- 1 seat for commercial/local business.

A UPG progress report was given (see below).

In view of the UPG membership issue, it was **agreed** that the PMC/UMC would continue to endorse projects.

### **17<sup>th</sup> December 1998**

It was **agreed** to make further representations to UK non-Governmental Departmental body *English Partnerships* over the slow progress of Easton Business Centre.

The Action Plan revision was presented. The most significant changes were:

- Full delegation of project approval to the UPG (£100,000 ERDF for revenue projects; £250,000 for capital projects and unlimited ESF).
- An increased budget for publicity, management and information to 5%.

It was **agreed** to discharge the delegated approval powers as above (although GOSW to continue eligibility checks and issue offer letters) and to approve the new 5% budget for publicity, management and information. It was also **agreed** to shift away from social projects (especially childcare), largely due to eligibility issues.

Further it was agreed the Action Plan should be re-drafted to:

- Tighten the framework for action by being more specific about the projects;
- Include references to new sources of New Deal funding.

The revised Action Plan simplified the financial tables for the benefit of local community interpretation, presenting them as if Bristol City Council as the Accountable Body was providing all the match-funding.

A UPG progress report was given (see below).

### **PMC Meetings Held During 1999**

#### **11<sup>th</sup> March 1999**

It was **agreed** to try to ensure a police representative attend and that a member of St George's school be admitted to the PMC.

A UPG progress report was given (see below).

The PMC/UMC **agreed** to write to the Commission to formally request a six-month extension. Bristol City Council agreed to settle the claims of small groups if this resulted in a delay in final payments.

An issue was raised that projects were considered to be funding-led and that the approved projects were failing to reflect the cultural diversity of the area (for example there were no projects funded from the black or ethnic minority groups). It was **agreed** that the Project Development Officer institute a system for monitoring ethnic leadership and beneficiaries of projects and to introduce the debate at the next UPG.

When asked, the EC representative was concerned at the lack of committed spend and only partially reassured by the number of pipeline projects at that time. The group commented that URBAN was a steep learning curve and it took time to establish relationships with community groups.

The Action Plan revisions were **approved**.

The PMC/UMC **agreed** to accept the Terms of Reference for the UK-wide URBAN I Programme evaluation, subject to the suggested inclusion of a community representative (perhaps via the URBAN Network).

#### **10<sup>th</sup> June 1999**

A UPG progress report was given (see below). There were difficulties with three key projects with resulting implications for outputs.

The UMC **approved** the following UPG recommendations:

- That the eligible period for physical completion of projects be extended from 31/12/2000 to 31/12/2001;
- That the 1998 ESF under-spend be rolled forward into 1999;
- That the 1998 ERDF under-spend be rolled forward into 1999/2000.

The issue of ethnic minorities' involvement in URBAN was discussed. In particular the need for:

- More detailed ethnically based monitoring;
- Capacity building measures aimed at individuals within communities;
- Ensuring the URBAN Programme underpins the ability of the ethnic minority community to have capacity to engage with funders;
- Integrated with recommendations from the Social Exclusion Unit Policy Action Team reports.

The PMC/UMC asked the UPG to discuss the issue of ethnic minorities' involvement and for the UPG to generate ideas for resolving it.

#### **9<sup>th</sup> September 1999**

The PMC/UMC **agreed** to accept the UPG Action Plan revisions as below:

- To account for exchange rate fluctuations
- The increased budget for Technical Assistance

- The proposed key fund (subject to Commission approval)
- Changes to the financial tables (see ***B2 financial modifications***).

The PMC/UMC **agreed** to instruct the Project Development Officer to prepare six monthly monitoring reports on ethnic minority participation, and extend this to include gender and those with disabilities.

A UPG progress report was given (see below).

### **The URBAN Partnership Group**

The PMC were presented with UPG progress reports throughout the Programme implementation period 1997, 1998 and 1999.

#### ***UPG Progress Reports During 1997***

During 1997, Programme management focused on establishing the PMC (see above), and, as a consequence of this, there were no UPG meetings held during 1997.

#### ***UPG Progress Reports During 1998***

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 27<sup>th</sup> March 1998 it was reported that:

- The UPG meetings were monthly. Time limited to 2 hours.
- Advertised in local papers (in local languages)
- Open forum at the start of each meeting
- Training sessions were offered and well supported.
- UPG members involved in project appraisal and worked alongside officers.

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 21<sup>st</sup> May 1998 it was reported that:

- The UPG meetings were not quorate; and that the UPG should come forward with proposals for improving its performance.
- A recurring theme from the community consultation was the comment that there was no disabled representation on the UPG; although after discussion the UPG said that whilst it should be as inclusive as possible there was no automatic place for every single interest group.
- A clear code of conduct for the UPG be established to guard against those with vested interests in projects biasing their chances of approval.

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 23<sup>rd</sup> July 1998 it was reported that:

- The UPG had rejected two projects on self-employment childminding;
- The project development officer had undertaken to provide a simplified guide and a pre-application form;
- UPG was to provide Secretariat with potentially supportable projects as early as possible to check eligibility.

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 20<sup>th</sup> August 1998 it was reported that:

- The simplified application form could be further simplified

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 17<sup>th</sup> December 1998 it was reported that:

- Special attention should be given to the under-performing outputs against targets;

- That GOSW should have an observer role on the UPG.

### ***UPG Progress Reports During 1999***

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 11<sup>th</sup> March 1999 it was reported that:

- The normally ineligible (due to retail components) Bristol East Side Trading (BEST) project had been discussed
- That the UPG had approved the publicity and awareness programme
- That the SOFA 2000 project had been returned to the applicant for minor amendments
- That the UPG approved the Barton Hill IT project but it had been returned to the applicant for minor amendments following GOSW appraisal

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 10<sup>th</sup> June 1999 it was reported that:

- Easton Business Centre continued to cause difficulties
- SOFA 2000 was being revised so the timetable could be met
- Employment Links was withdrawn

At the UMC/PMC meeting of the 9<sup>th</sup> September 1999 it was reported that:

- There were difficulties in galvanising community interest (when compared to the experience in New Deal for Communities where a full three years of capacity building had provided a platform for full community participation). Nonetheless, significant progress in URBAN had been made in engaging the community and the difficulties facing Bristol were similar to those in other URBAN areas.

The results of the report into Black and Ethnic Minority beneficiary monitoring was received. This report indicated that, at that point, 34% of project beneficiaries were from this target group; two of the twelve projects were BME-led and that these two projects were in receipt of 33% of all URBAN funding. This compared favourably to the 30% representation in the URBAN area.

The UPG also met on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2000

The UPG agreed that eligible projects would be invited to apply for the Measure 1 under-spend of £24,689 (***see B2 Modifications to Financial Tables***), and that a special Project Appraisal Panel would meet to appraise submitted applications on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2000 and then make recommendations to the UPG.

The special panel appraisal met to decide upon additional funding for existing projects, using the criteria:

- the agreed eligibility criteria for new projects;
- the agreed scoring mechanism for appraising new projects; and
- performance of projects to date and risk/reality assessment.

It was agreed to approve the reallocation of £24,689 Measure 1 ERDF funding equally between the SOFA Project and Bristol East Side Traders in line with their submitted applications.

## **B2 Modifications to financial tables decided with indication of transfer of Funds between priorities, measures, years**

### **Financial Allocation By Measure**

The Bristol URBAN I programme received an initial Structural Fund allocation of 4.506 €million of which 3.456 €million was drawn from ERDF and 1.050 €million from ESF. The ERDF allocation was split between two separate measures, New Economic Activities and Local Capacity, with Measure 1: New Economic Activities by far the largest in financial terms.

<b>Original Financial Allocations By Measure, €million</b>							
	<b>Fund</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Total Public</b>	<b>ERDF</b>	<b>ESF</b>	<b>Other Public</b>	<b>Private</b>
M1: New Economic Activities	ERDF	7.707	6.955	3.110		3.845	0.752
M2: Local Capacity	ERDF	0.722	0.693	0.346		0.347	0.029
M3: Improving Prospects	ESF	3.049	2.186		1.050	1.136	0.863
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>11.478</b>	<b>9.834</b>	<b>3.456</b>	<b>1.050</b>	<b>5.328</b>	<b>1.644</b>

Source: Commission Decision; the figures take into account the indexation for 1997

The long lead-in and development process to put the systems and structures in place meant the Programme got off to a slow start. This created pressure to commit funds quickly in the second half of the Programme in 1998 and 1999. This was only partially successful, and so the UPG proposed that the PMC/UMC accept revisions to the financial allocations during the latter part of 1999 (with the revisions accepted at the 9<sup>th</sup> September PMC, 1999). In the main this related to the virement of resources into a new Technical Assistance measure out of Measure 1, and the virement of some of the Measure 1 monies into Measure 2.

The approved Action Plan revisions for the Bristol URBAN I Programme set out the revised financial profile which incorporated the following changes:

- Virement of £154,225 from Measure 1 ERDF into Measure 2;
- Virement of £401,881 from Measure 1 to the new Technical Assistance Measure 4;
- A reduction in the match-funding for the ERDF Measures by £397,155; and
- A reduction in the match-funding for the ESF Measure by £342,147.

<b>Revised Financial Allocations By Measure , €million</b>							
	<b>Fund</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Total Public</b>	<b>ERDF</b>	<b>ESF</b>	<b>Other Public</b>	<b>Private</b>
M1: New Economic Activities	ERDF	5.333	4.847	2.242	0.000	2.605	0.485
M2: Local Capacity	ERDF	1.223	1.176	0.587	0.000	0.590	0.047
M3: Improving Prospects	ESF	2.515	2.065	0.000	1.050	1.015	0.450
M4: Technical Assistance	ERDF	1.254	1.155	0.627	0.000	0.528	0.098
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>10.325</b>	<b>9.244</b>	<b>3.456</b>	<b>1.050</b>	<b>4.738</b>	<b>1.081</b>

Source: Commission Decision

### **Financial Allocations by Year**

The original financial allocation was profiled as per the following table, which envisaged a peak in the second year of the Programme, 1998.

<b>Original Financial Allocations By Year, €million</b>						
	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Total Public</b>	<b>ERDF</b>	<b>ESF</b>	<b>Other Public</b>	<b>Private</b>
1997	2.888	2.404	0.578	0.301	1.525	0.484
1998	4.594	3.973	1.572	0.360	2.041	0.621
1999	3.996	3.457	1.306	0.389	1.762	0.539
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.478</b>	<b>9.834</b>	<b>3.456</b>	<b>1.050</b>	<b>5.328</b>	<b>1.644</b>

Source: Commission Decision

The slow start to the Programme led to an under-spend in 1997 and the PMC agreed that uncommitted monies be rolled forward into the following year i.e. 1997 under-commitment into 1998. The 'roll-forward' continued into subsequent years. The revised financial Tables set out in the Action Plan are detailed as follows. The revised financial allocations were incorporated into the Action Plan following UPG recommendation to the PMC/UMC, 9<sup>th</sup> September 1999 and reflected the forecast expenditure profile at the time of the 1999 Action Plan revisions.

<b>Revised Financial Allocations By Year , €million</b>						
	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Total Public</b>	<b>ERDF</b>	<b>ESF</b>	<b>Other Public</b>	<b>Private</b>
1997	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1998	0.239	0.220	0.077	0.029	0.114	0.019
1999	3.479	3.091	0.996	0.483	1.612	0.388
2000	4.002	3.550	1.218	0.537	1.795	0.452
2001	2.605	2.383	1.165	0.000	1.218	0.223
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10.325</b>	<b>9.244</b>	<b>3.456</b>	<b>1.050</b>	<b>4.738</b>	<b>1.081</b>
Source: Commission Decision 9 <sup>th</sup> September 1999 (i.e. date when Action Plan revisions endorsed)						

### **B3 Details of any modifications to the programme management and monitoring systems**

The initial Programme Document established a Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC) and an Urban Management Committee (UMC). The function of the PMC was to oversee the implementation of URBAN. The UMC was intended to be a sub-committee of the PMC to oversee the administration, implementation and monitoring of the Programme with main tasks to:

- Commission capacity building work including community audits to create or enhance the UPG;
- Invite the UPG to submit a draft Urban Action Plan;
- Examine, discuss with the UPG, and agree the Action Plan;
- Agree the detailed arrangements for the UPG to take forward the Urban Action Plan;
- Submit to the PMC annual progress reports on the URBAN Programme based on the UPG reports;
- Agree the arrangements for the promotion and publicity of the programme;
- Make arrangements for the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Urban Action Plan.

Given the size of the Programme Area, and the close relationship between the PMC and the UMC, it was agreed that the two committees could be amalgamated, with the PMC/UMC fulfilling the functions described above. No other changes were made to Programme and management arrangements.

### **B4 Use of technical assistance linked to the management and monitoring of the programme, results observed**

There was no initial allocation to Technical Assistance. 0.627meuro were subsequently allocated to Technical Assistance following an introduction by special decision. The ERDF Technical Assistance was introduced as a Measure 4, which allowed the Programme to operate a Key Fund. The Key Fund was intended to allow funds to be committed in the latter stage of the Programme. This resource was not directly attached to the implementation of the Programme, rather, some of the allocated resource to Measure 2 for Capacity Building contributed to Programme management, for example additional administrative support and the costs of the project development officer.

### **B5 Information and Publicity: activities undertaken**

In line with the Structural Fund Regulations, all approved Bristol URBAN I projects were required to publicise the contribution of the EU. A range of methods were deployed including permanent plaques in ERDF-supported facilities, prominent signage, specific press releases and acknowledgement in all

relevant documentation. Monitoring of the publicity measures undertaken by project applicants was undertaken by the relevant Secretariat as part of the claims process.

More specifically, all letterheads, monitoring forms and contracts displayed the ERDF logo and the Bristol URBAN I specific web-site acknowledged the role of all European funds. Information and publicity formed a key part of Programme implementation. In 1998/1999 for example, four newsletters and information sheets were produced and delivered to over 250 groups/individuals.

The promotion of the Programme within the Bristol URBAN I area and beyond has been a key feature of the Bristol Programme implementation 1997-1999. For example:

- Promotion and awareness of URBAN I was one of the projects supported under Measure 2 of the Programme receiving circa £110,000 of ERDF;
- The Capacity Building Plan developed during the Programme had an objective to increase participation by local residents in the Programme, and was held up as an exemplar of good practice by the national interim evaluation. The capacity building plan incorporated a newsheet and resources book/directory, community training, and mentoring support;
- Forty-four groups supported the development of the URBAN I Programme; and
- a web-site was established for the Programme which further aided the flow of information to local groups.

The Bristol Partnership was part of the URBAN I network in Great Britain. The UPG attended the national conference in Hackney, London in 1999, and played a full role in other network events. The UPG utilised the Eurocities network as a vehicle for the dissemination of the Programme.

#### **B6      *Observance of Community Policies***

All URBAN I application forms were accompanied with guidance notes. UPG project appraisal decisions were endorsed by the PMC/UMC, and submitted applications were checked by the Secretariat to ensure compliance with Community Policies as laid out in the Operational Programme Document. These include Competition Policy, Award of Public Contracts, Protection of the Environment, Equal Opportunities for men and women, other Community Policies and general provisions.

The need to comply with EU policies is also reiterated in grant offer letters made to project sponsors. The information provided in the application form is checked and monitored by the relevant Secretariat in order to ensure compliance is maintained. No cases of irregularity were notified during 1997, 1998 or 1999.

All contracts were below the threshold for advertising in the Official Journal of the European Communities. No schemes required notification to the European Community under the state aid rules, whilst no environmental impact assessments were required.

## C PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

### C1 *Financial Aspects*

#### ERDF and ESF commitments

##### **For 1997**

As stated, Programme implementation started slowly as the strategy, Action Plan and management systems were being developed and refined, and this was reflected in the low levels of commitment during the first year. As with other URBAN I areas, and in keeping with the aspirations for the URBAN Programme, the initial efforts were focused on activities to build the capacity of the local community to participate in the Programme and in formulating and developing a community based bottom-up strategy and Action Plan. Measure 2 projects in relation to capacity building (the Capacity Building Plan) and the project development worker were approved by the PMC in December of 1997 although formal grant letters to project sponsors followed after this. The low level of project approvals was not surprising and the revised financial allocations rolled all financial allocation forward into later years of the Programme (*see B2 modifications to financial tables*).

##### **For 1998**

The partnership progressed several project ideas which resulted in full project applications during 1998 as the Programme gathered momentum, although the continued development of the Action Plan during the early months of the year resulted in lower levels of commitment during the first part of the year. As with other URBAN areas the time taken to adapt to the innovative nature of URBAN led to slower progress on project commitments than may have been previously expected, for example additional staff and officer time was devoted to addressing concerns over the representation of UPG membership.

Nonetheless, a number of capital and revenue projects were approved during 1998, from both ERDF and ESF. The UMC/PMC endorsed the Bristol Foyer capital project, the Bristol Care and Repair ESF project, the Fast Track ESF project; and the Easton Business Centre ERDF project. The ERDF/ESF funds attached to the endorsed projects are presented in the Table overleaf although in many cases grant offer letters followed a little time later. More details of these projects are given in **C2 Implementation of Programme Measures**.

<b>Financial Commitments By Measure in 1998 (£)</b>		
	<b>Allocation<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Commitment to 31/12/1998<sup>2</sup></b>
M1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)	18,819	600,000 <sup>2</sup>
M2: Local Capacity (ERDF)	31,048	165,767 <sup>2</sup>
M3: Improving Prospects (ESF)	18,865	18,769
M4: Technical Assistance	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>68,732</b>	<b>784,536</b>

<sup>1</sup> Revised Allocation. Revisions accepted 9<sup>th</sup> September 1999. Exchange rates: ERDF £1= 1.641 euro, ESF £1= 1.641 euro

<sup>2</sup> Commitments relate to projects endorsed by the UMC/PMC (grant offer letters were issued after UPG project approvals and UMC/PMC project endorsements)

##### **For 1999**

A modest pace for commitments continued during the early months of 1999. In part this related to the determination of the URBAN partnership to see quality projects approved that fully met the aspirations set out in the Action Plan (for example the need to reflect cultural diversity) and in part due to the continuing need to build community capacity and develop projects. As a consequence more time and effort was devoted to management and administration than may have been previously expected, for example in monitoring the success of the Programme in developing ethnic minority led projects.

The number of UPG project approvals increased through 1999 and this is reflected in strong commitment levels by the end of the year. For example, the UPG approved the publicity and awareness programme and the Barton Hill Information Technology centre capital ERDF project and supporting ESF training applications. The Growing Together ERDF/ESF projects were also

endorsed. Pipeline projects such as the SOFA 2000 project were approved. For many of the projects, however, the majority of spend was forecast to occur through 2000 and into 2001. More details of these projects are given in **C2 Implementation of Programme Measures**.

<b>Financial Commitments By Measure in 1999 (£)</b>		
	<b>Allocation<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Commitment during 1999<sup>2</sup></b>
M1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)	534,032	1,170,296
M2: Local Capacity (ERDF)	103,259	209,922
M3: Improving Prospects (ESF)	309,877	489,785
M4: Technical Assistance	1,250	68,987
<b>Total</b>	<b>948,418</b>	<b>1,938,990</b>

<sup>1</sup> Revised Allocation. Revisions accepted 9<sup>th</sup> September 1999. Exchange rates: ERDF £1= 1.641 euro, ESF £1= 1.641 euro  
<sup>2</sup> Commitments relate to projects endorsed by the UMC/PMC (grant offer letters are likely to have been issued at later dates)

In effect, almost all the remaining funds available to URBAN I were committed by the end of 1999 despite the fact that many of these projects were not going to complete till late 2000 or 2001. A Key Fund was also established at the very end of 1999 to help overcome one of the barriers to project approvals – that of disparate sources of match-funding which occasionally resulted in project co-ordination becoming prohibitively complex. However, the Key Fund looked to be slightly less successful than had been hoped which partly explained the shortfall in overall commitments (see below).

### 1997-1999 Summary

The following Table summarises the commitment by year, which indicates that commitment levels increased significantly as the Programme progressed.

<b>Financial Commitments By Measure 1997-1999 (£)</b>				
	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>1997-1999</b>
M1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)	-	600,000	1,170,296	1,770,296
M2: Local Capacity (ERDF)	-	165,767	209,922	375,689
M3: Improving Prospects (ESF)	-	18,769	489,785	508,554
M4: Technical Assistance	-	-	68,987	68,987
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>784,536</b>	<b>1,938,990</b>	<b>2,723,526</b>

<sup>1</sup> Revised Allocation. Revisions accepted 9<sup>th</sup> September 1999. Exchange rates: ERDF £1= 1.641 euro, ESF £1= 1.641 euro

An overall commitment level of 94.3% was achieved by the Programme during 1997, 1998, 1999. Against the revised financial allocations the final Programme commitments indicated an over-spend against Measure 1 for New Economic Activities, and an under-spend against ESF and the Measure 4 Technical Assistance. For Measure 4 the lower than hoped for commitment in the last part of 1999 was due to difficulties in assembling the match-funding and, as a result, a total of £67,500 was committed against a revised allocation of £401,000. Details of the virement between Measures is presented in section B2. Nonetheless, despite the long lead-in times associated with the Programme's implementation and despite the relatively low levels of committed expenditure during 1997 and 1998, the overall Programme commitment levels were high by the end of the 1999.

<b>Financial Commitments By Measure 1997-1999 (£)</b>			
	<b>Allocation<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Commitment to 31/12/1999</b>	<b>% Committed to 31/12/1999</b>
M1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)	1.437	1.770	123.2
M2: Local Capacity (ERDF)	0.376	0.376	100.0
M3: Improving Prospects (ESF)	0.673	0.509	75.6
M4: Technical Assistance	0.401	0.069	17.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.887</b>	<b>2.724</b>	<b>94.3</b>

<sup>1</sup> Revised Allocation. Revisions accepted 9<sup>th</sup> September 1999. Exchange rates: ERDF £1= 1.641 euro, ESF £1= 1.641 euro

Financial Payments by YearERDF and ESF Payments

Certified eligible expenditure by year, disaggregated, indicates that the majority of expenditure was made during 1999 and 2000.

**Certified Eligible Expenditure by Year £**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total
M1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)	46,226	63,485	870,904	2,750,373	493,710	4,224,698
M2: Local Capacity (ERDF)	0	59,971	135,906	415,056	150,290	761,223
M3: Improving Prospects (ESF)	0	95,610	388,360	785,642	0	1,269,612
M4: Technical Assistance (ERDF)	0	0	382	57,328	76,790	134,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>46,226</b>	<b>219,066</b>	<b>1,395,552</b>	<b>4,008,399</b>	<b>720,790</b>	<b>6,390,033</b>

Source : Government Office for the South West

**Certified Eligible Expenditure by Source £**

	ERDF	ESF	Public/ Private	Total
M1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)	1,761,344	-	2,463,354	4,224,698
M2: Local Capacity (ERDF)	350,911	-	410,312	761,223
M3: Improving Prospects (ESF)	-	506,691	762,921	1,269,612
M4: Technical Assistance (ERDF)	67,250	-	67,250	134,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,179,505</b>	<b>506,691</b>	<b>3,703,837</b>	<b>6,390,033</b>

Source: Government Office for the South West

Final Position Summary

For ERDF, 95.7% of grant committed was paid to project sponsors, with certified eligible expenditure £4.984m out of the £5.117m committed.

**Cumulative ERDF Financial Payments By Measure at 31/03/02, £**

Measure	Grant Committed	Grant Paid	% Paid/Committed
M1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)	1.770	1.761	99.5
M2: Local Capacity (ERDF)	0.376	0.351	93.4
M4: Technical Assistance (ERDF)	0.069	0.067	97.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.215</b>	<b>2.179</b>	<b>98.4</b>

Source: Government Office for the South West

Full ESF payments have been made for the ESF committed under URBAN I in Bristol.

**Cumulative ESF Financial Payments at 31/03/02, £**

	Grant Committed	Grant Paid	% Paid/Committed
M3: Improving Prospects (ESF)	0.509	0.506	99.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.509</b>	<b>0.506</b>	<b>99.4</b>

Source: Government Office for the South West

Payments received from the Commission

There was a single payment made by the Commission to the Bristol URBAN I Programme which fed through to the Government Office on 15<sup>th</sup> October 1997.

Fund	First Tranche Date Received	£million	Second Tranche Date Received	£million
ERDF/ESF	15 <sup>th</sup> October 1997	£1,195,682,20	To be received	£717,409.32

Source: Government Office for the South West

### Contributions from the EIB

There were no contributions from the European Investment Bank to projects approved during the lifetime of the Programme.

## **C2 Implementation of the Programme Measures**

### **Measure 1: New Economic Activities (ERDF)**

Eight projects were approved during 1997, 1998 and 1999 under Measure 1. A brief summary of some of the project activity is given below (a full list of project is in **Annex C**). For Measure 1, the emphasis of the URBAN I Programme was on offering both capital and revenue support to facilitate entrepreneurship and small business development. Many of the ERDF capital projects in Measure 1 (e.g. Barton Hill Workshops) were accompanied by a corresponding ESF training project operating on the premises.

**Bristol FOYER: (ERDF of £300,000):** Sponsored by the Knightstone Housing Association, the project involved the construction of an Information Technology training facility. The ERDF project was part of a wider scheme which included residential units for 50 young people. The aim of the project was to provide support to young people by offering a place to live and programme of training.

**Easton Business Centre Extension (ERDF of £300,000):** Sponsored by East Bristol Enterprise, the project involved the construction of 19 new business workshops.

**Bristol East Side Traders: (ERDF of £491,200):** Sponsored by the Bristol URBAN Traders Partnership, the project was to provide business development and retail support work. Bristol URBAN Traders combined the St Pauls and St Agnes Traders Associations and the Trade Association in Easton. Supported by a range of local partners (St Agnes and St Werburgh's Renewal Team, Easton Renewal Team and Bristol Area Community Enterprise Network - BACEN) and the private sector, the project provided business mentors and training opportunities to participating SMEs, and compiled a business directory of the URBAN I area SMEs.

**Growing Together (ERDF of £198,000):** Sponsored by BCC Leisure Services, and supported by CEED (Charity) Ltd, Cannington College and BACEN the project was to provide grounds maintenance and the improvement of local green spaces. This was supported by an ESF project to deliver vocational training through New Deal targeted at black and other minority groups. The project led to the setting up of a community enterprise, with users/local communities to continue the maintenance and improvements of the sites.

**Training and Resources for the New Millennium (ERDF of £27,258):** Sponsored by the Barton Hill Settlement, the project was to refurbish and equip a computer training facility to be used as a computer drop-in centre. The project provided 12 quality workstations. The ERDF project was supported by an ESF project to provide both accredited and non-accredited training courses.

### **Measure 2: Local Capacity (ERDF)**

Five projects were approved under Measure 2 to build capacity in the URBAN I area. Examples of project activity are given below.

**URBAN Capacity Building I: (ERDF of £4,817):** Sponsored by Bristol City Council Community Development Unit, the project was to prepare a Capacity Building Plan. This was to be followed up with the full URBAN Capacity Building Plan implementation and delivery (see below).

**Urban Capacity Building II (ERDF of £99,940):** Sponsored by Bristol City Council Community Development Unit, the project was to deliver the Capacity Building Plan. The project included regular newsletters and information dissemination, training (Community Action Training, funding programmes,

monitoring), the URBAN-specific Community Development worker, project development grants (small grants for management committee) and partnership support (local partnership project).

**Programme Development Worker (ERDF of £61,010):** Sponsored by Bristol City Council, the project was to provide the costs of a Programme manager dedicated to URBAN.

**Participation and Awareness (ERDF of £110,243):** Sponsored by Bristol City Council and designed to deliver and resource a capacity building programme to: raise awareness of the opportunities of URBAN; make URBAN more accessible to the local community and enhance local participation; evaluate the programme and its effectiveness in partnership with local residents; and increase the capacity of the UPG to effectively administer and deliver the Programme. In effect, the project provided 2.5 full-time equivalent staff to support the administration of the programme.

### ***Measure 3 (ESF): Improving Prospects***

Measure 3 offers training support for those resident in the Programme Area. Many of these projects are linked to ERDF projects that are also supported by the Programme.

**FastTrack Trainee Support Project (ESF of £74,078):** Fast Track Trust is a voluntary sector organisation which has offered vocational training to inner city residents since the early 1990s. The project provided support and guidance to enable local people to access training and employment. Specifically, URBAN enabled Fast Track to extend its support to a second guidance session to eligible beneficiaries to further help them in the transition from training to further employment/training.

**Integrated Neighbourhood Home Maintenance and Training Scheme (ESF of £88,248):** Sponsored by Care and Repair, the project provided educational training and on-the job work experience for unemployed persons, particularly women, in carrying out practical home improvements for the elderly.

**Positive Action Partnership Scheme (ESF of £4,466):** Sponsored by the West of England Centre for Integrated Learning, the project provided employment and enterprise training for local disabled people, in conjunction with New Deal, including careers guidance and Jobsearch help.

**New Deal Trinity (ESF of £40,000):** Sponsored by Scout Enterprises (Western) Ltd, the project offered New Deal placements NVQ accredited training whilst carrying out the creation and upgrade of the New Trinity Arts Centre to provide training and exhibition space for local and citywide projects.

### ***Measure 4: Key Fund (ERDF)***

**URBAN Key Fund (ERDF of £67,500):** a small project which assembled a range of match funding sources to provide small scale support to applicants in developing ideas and implementing small scale activities.

### ***C3 Analysis of achievements, outputs and impacts of the Programme overall***

The Action Plan established a range of targets for the Bristol URBAN I Programme, disaggregated by Measure. Against almost all of the indicators selected, the actual achievement out-performed the Action Plan target (see Table below). Further, for many of the indicators, the actual achievement exceeded the forecasts of the project sponsors at the outset of these projects.

URBAN I significantly out-performed Measure 1 targets for advice and guidance support and for new businesses assisted. The Programme also built more enterprise workspace units and met its target number for the number of community businesses established. Similarly, the Programme exceeded its targets for the involvement of organisations and local people in economic regeneration and in

capacity building, although the scale of supported/involved organisations/individuals in URBAN was far lower than originally forecast in the Action Plan.

<b>Progress Towards Quantified Targets</b>				
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Programme Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Forecast Value 31/12/99</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Outputs</b>				
People benefiting from advice and support	M1	280	450	799
New businesses assisted	M1	15	100	49
Enterprise workspace built	M1	19	23	23
Community Businesses Established	M1	2	3	2
Org's Assisted via Capacity Bdg Measures	M2	20	108	206
Reps from local groups participating in economic regeneration process	M2	20	110	217
Reps from local groups participating in capacity building	M2	25	112	173
Local partnerships and networks established	M2	5	6	12
People receiving guidance and advice	M3	400	1815	1212
People accessing training programmes	M3	250	614	721
People accessing training & support programmes	M3	700	624	486
People receiving mentoring support via training	M3	40	408	231
Traineeships	All	660	614	721
Traineeships for under 25s	All	330	333	273
Black and ethnic minority recipients of employment and training advice	All	1000	1187	1031
<b>Results</b>				
Area business and investment plans completed	M1	1	1	0
Jobs created and safeguarded	M1	155	364	266
	M2	1.5	10	19
	M3	4.5	54.5	41
People attaining NVQs 1,2,3	M3	130	231	41

Source: Final Report to the UPG; above include Measure 4 Key Fund targets

For the Measure 3 targets for ESF the Programme provided more beneficiaries with guidance and advice than its original forecast, and offered more beneficiaries access to training programmes, although in the case of the former the project sponsors did not meet their own forecast volumes. Whilst the target for those accessing training programmes was exceeded, the target for those accessing training and support programmes was not met; this in part reflects definitional differences although the training without support was in practice less intensive and hence more straightforward to provide.

The Programme established a specific target for black and ethnic minorities in receipt of employment and training advice in view of the particular disadvantages faced by the group and the high representation in the URBAN area. The target of 1,000 recipients was slightly exceeded despite concerns in the earlier parts of the Programme's implementation that the needs of the ethnic minority groups were not being addressed. The URBAN I Programme successfully improved the targeting of ethnic minority groups during its implementation.

For the results indicators of jobs created and safeguarded, the Programme exceeded its Measure 1, 2 and 3 target by 100%, with the achievement of 326 jobs, more than twice the target of 161. Although the original target was somewhat modest, the good achievement reflects the fact that URBAN met the majority of its activity targets, and that the Programme focused on providing the right type of intensive support required to enable residents to overcome barriers to employment and take up local employment opportunities. For ESF activities, the number of qualifications achieved failed to meet the set targets, in part due to a lower proportion than expected of ESF training being directly linked to accredited qualifications.

The achievements of the Bristol URBAN I Programme by the end of 1999 were considerable given the relatively slow pace of project approvals at the start of the Programme. In part this reflects the quality and appropriateness of many of the projects in accessing target groups in the area.

## **D EVALUATION**

### ***D1 General description of relevant programme evaluation undertaken***

In accordance with EC regulations, an interim evaluation of the GB URBAN I programme was commissioned by the managing authority, the Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions and jointly funded by the DETR and EC. Given the new approach which was pursued for URBAN and the timing of the evaluation in 1999 when many URBAN partnerships were beginning to operate more effectively, the interim evaluation placed a considerable emphasis on 'process' issues, such as the extent of community involvement, as well as the quantifiable outcomes from the Programme to that date.

Specifically, the GB Interim Evaluation undertook a review of:

1. Financial Performance
2. The Action Planning approach
3. Capacity building and facilitating Community Involvement
4. Administration and Partnership working
5. Match-funding and Complementarity.

The Evaluation comprised a review of the 19 URBAN areas in Great Britain (a separate evaluation was commissioned by the Department for Development for the URBAN I Programme in Northern Ireland). The Evaluation incorporated the following approaches:

- a postal survey of 400 individuals from a broad cross section of organisations involved in the Urban Partnership Group, as well as partners not represented on the formal structures;
- review of 19 Action Plans and Monitoring Reports covering financial performance to date and aggregate forecast data regarding project commitment and outputs;
- 13 regional workshops, involving a cross-section of the partnership, used to further develop issues identified in the postal survey, particularly in relation to best practice and in identifying case studies;
- 30 face-to-face interviews, carried out with Government Office staff, those responsible within the Accountable Body, Urban Partnership Group staff and community members, in order to provide a comprehensive qualitative assessment of the Programme.

### ***D2 Synthesis of results***

The following synthesis of results applied to the whole of URBAN in Great Britain, not only to the Bristol URBAN I Programme. The key conclusions of the GB Interim Evaluation were:

Financial Performance: At the time of the evaluation, between 50% and 60% of the overall allocation of funds across the 19 areas was committed; and the interim evaluation forecast a final under-spend of between 10% and 20%.

Action Planning: Action Plans were regarded as a powerful delivery mechanism, provided that the local community was given sufficient time and support to participate fully in the development of the Plan.

Capacity Building: Across URBAN in Great Britain as a whole, the interim evaluation stated:

- Capacity building initiatives delivered across the URBAN areas varied, but that, on the whole, capacity building activities were under-valued by partners despite the long-term benefits to the community
- URBAN was in some areas too remote from local communities and the language/jargon/processes acted as a disincentive to local participation in many cases
- Dedicated Programme staff were regarded as essential for delivering a community-led approach

It should be noted that the Bristol URBAN I Programme was praised by the GB Evaluation for its capacity building activity (see below), and the results given above were general comments on URBAN I in GB as a whole at an early stage of the national Programme implementation.

#### Administration and Partnership Working

The GB Evaluation collated a large amount of information on this issue. The key points related to:

- Co-operation and partnership between all sectors improved considerably over time alongside an improved understanding of the complexities of the URBAN Programme
- The design and operation of appropriate monitoring systems proved to be demanding and time consuming for UPGs. The merging of URBAN with SRB processes was less successful than hoped for and, in most cases, a specific URBAN monitoring/claiming system had to be set up. UPGs and project applicants required intensive briefing and mentoring to accommodate EU requirements

Local authorities played an important role as the Accountable Body. There are a number of factors that made this role far from straightforward. These include:

- Because of perceived deficiencies, more resources were made available to local authorities as Accountable Bodies in order to meet the range of responsibilities associated with Accountable Body status and to reflect the innovative nature of many projects;
- Occasional uncertainty over the eligibility of particular activities (reflecting the innovative nature of many proposed projects); and
- Initial uncertainty as to the degree of risk or innovation that should be allowed for particular types of activities.

Over time working relationships between UPGs and Accountable Bodies improved and differences in approach and agenda were often overcome by the appointment of nominated, dedicated UPG officers, who could be seen as more independent and objective.

Government Offices had overall responsibility for the URBAN Community Initiative and were represented on the Programme Monitoring Committee and URBAN Management Committee to oversee programme implementation and complementary issues. Overall, Government Offices were regarded as helpful and supportive in dealing with technical issues, even if there were initial difficulties regarding consistency. Any delays reflected that Action Planning was a new approach for GO and the wider Partnership.

The role and function of the URBAN Management Committee was often merged with the regional Programme Monitoring Committees (PMC) responsible for overseeing Structural Funds.

Regarding the UK URBAN Network, which actively supported the URBAN regions since June 1998, the overall assessment was, that the Network delivered a comprehensive service and proved to be a positive vehicle for UPGs to receive information, to connect and to share experiences.

#### Match-funding and Complementarity

The overwhelming majority of URBAN community partners at the national level regarded match-funding as the major barrier to successful involvement of local community groups in URBAN. Not only was the overall concept of match-funding difficult to comprehend for small community organisations, but also match funding sources such as SRB were seen as not as straightforward as expected. In most areas, Government Offices and local authorities were unprepared for the differences, which existed between both programmes.

The other important sources of match-funding were the local authorities. In some cases local authorities provided ring fenced budgets and up-front funding to project applicants, which proved most helpful to overcome cash flow and match funding problems usually experienced by small organisations.

The use of contributions 'in-kind', or volunteer time as match-funding was modest. This was partly due to the perceived lack of experience in Government Offices as to how such contributions could be used effectively within projects. Difficulties arising in the use of in-kind contributions were identified by a number of community groups in URBAN I across the country.

Alternatives to match funding were strongly recommended in the form of Community Chests and Key Funds, which represented a much more accessible form of support for local communities.

### ***D3 Proposals and recommendations resulting from evaluations, including any reorientation of the Programme***

Recommendations arising from the GB Interim Evaluation focused primarily on process issues. In relation to:

Action Planning:

- That the relevant UK Government department produces a comprehensive reference manual for ERDF, to be made available to all of those involved in Structural Fund Programmes, including local UPG members;
- That the relevant UK Government department produces an URBAN specific supplement for the new Programme, to be included in the reference manual and distributed to new partners and community groups.
- Action Plans should continue to be the preferred delivery mechanism for URBAN initiatives.
- The development of Action Plans should be accompanied by up-front, 100% funded capacity-building activities for UPG members, related groups and individuals.
- Action Plans must incorporate networking as an activity and budget line.
- A broader, and separate range of indicators are developed for the new URBAN Programme (and for any URBAN type initiatives funded through future Objective 1 and 2 Programmes), that take account of the range of projects that have been funded in the current Programme and which recognise that results and impacts may be indirect or longer term.

Capacity Building and Community Involvement:

- the financial structure of Action Plans should incorporate start-up 100% funding for capacity-building measures and small-scale grant schemes.
- capacity building, to increase the ability of community groups to develop and implement projects, should be recognised as an on-going process, and should be a key element of all future URBAN initiatives.
- the number and variety of community and target groups and/or individuals actively involved in URBAN Programmes should be a key performance indicator.
- the implementation of Action Plans should be facilitated by a dedicated, well qualified staff team.
- up to a maximum of 10% of funds (across all Measures) be made available for innovative/pilot projects, such as exploring alternative avenues within the parameters of eligibility, but where there is a higher than average degree of risk as regards achievement of targets.
- a broader, and separate range of indicators are developed for the new URBAN Programme (and for any URBAN type initiatives funded through future Objective 1 and 2 Programmes), that take account of the range of projects that have been funded in the current Programme and which recognise that results and impacts may be indirect or longer term.

#### Administration and Partnership Working:

- UPGs commit to changing membership to allow new groups and/or individuals an opportunity to participate in the management of the Action Plan, on the basis that UPG members must be accountable to broader local structures so that transparency and democracy can be assured;
- the co-financing of Action Plans in advance, or centrally, should be used to introduce simplified application procedures for project sponsors;
- Service Level Agreements ought to be established between the UPG and the Accountable Body;
- all additional costs involved in providing the Accountable Body function should be eligible for technical assistance;
- forward funding should be considered more widely by Accountable Bodies in order to overcome cash-flow problems of smaller applicant organisations;
- the URBAN Network should open its membership to UPGs funded through Objective 1 and Objective 2 funded Groups;
- the URBAN Network should be eligible for technical assistance in future programmes; and
- that in future Programmes a national Programme Monitoring Committee should be established.

#### Match-funding and Complementarity:

The main recommendation for future programmes was to arrange for match-funding if not at source then at least at measure level up-front. 60% and 70% of future URBAN (and URBAN type) Action Plans should be co-financed in advance i.e. when the Action Plan is agreed. This would not only help the local community in accessing funding in a more simple manner, but it would also contribute directly to a more strategic use of available resources in a given region.

#### Overall GB Evaluation Conclusions:

- URBAN has successfully engaged community groups in the development of locally based regeneration activities;
- A successor Programme for the UK should be welcomed, although changes in organisation and procedures are required; and
- The experience of existing Groups should not be lost at the end of the current period, and where appropriate URBAN Programme Groups should be supported to continue their work.

#### **The Bristol URBAN I Programme**

The Bristol URBAN Programme comprised just one of the 19 URBAN areas subject to the evaluation and not all of the above points was relevant to the Bristol Programme. The Interim Evaluation however also examined the issue of Best Practice, compiling a Best Practice Handbook. Bristol was singled out as an example of good practice in two areas:

- The three-stage application process; and
- The Capacity Building Plan.

The Best Practice from the Bristol URBAN I Programme is described below:

#### Three-Stage Application Process

##### Stage One:

The first stage represented an Advanced Notice Form, a short and simple tick-box form to inform the URBAN officers about the brief details of a new intended project. This form was used by programme officers and the UPG to check basic eligibility of the project, and whether the project should be taken to the next stage.

##### Stage Two:

The second stage included the URBAN Pro-forma, or Initial Application Form which was a longer, more detailed form, which covered most of the questions in the standard ESF/ERDF Application

Forms, but in a more accessible language and style. In addition, this form could be used to ask for more detail on the applicant organisation, or to refer more specifically to the objectives, outputs and target groups of the relevant Action Plan, in order to enable the UPG or Appraisal Panel to assess the application more easily. This form provided the basis for the UPG appraisal and, if in favour, for recommendation for final approval. If the application was successful at this stage, the project applicant was asked to fill in the standard ERDF/ESF application form.

#### Stage Three:

At Stage Three, the applicant was required to fill in the standard ERDF or ESF application form. Having gone through the previous stages, applicants had already developed a greater understanding of the information requested and could now relate more easily to the standard ERDF/ESF forms.

The Three-Stage process allowed the applicant to get slowly introduced to the amount of information required (usually UPG staff offered hands-on advice throughout the process), and it also enabled the UPG appraisal process to pre-assess projects and predict programme development. In addition, this application system helped to avoid wasting time and efforts for all involved, as ineligible or inappropriate projects were detected early on in the process.

#### The Capacity Building Plan

The Capacity Building programme in Bristol was structured as a Business Plan and represented a comprehensive package of capacity building available to groups and communities within the URBAN focus area. The Business Plan corresponded to the objectives and output targets identified in the URBAN Action Plan.

The Evaluation stated that the approach adopted in Bristol was particularly valuable since it demonstrated a community oriented capacity building plan which addressed identified community needs in a flexible and comprehensive manner.

The Business Plan was a detailed and clearly written document, identifying all key actions, funding structures, output targets, milestones, monitoring etc. It provided a good framework to guide and monitor the capacity building process over a three-year period. Particular attention was given to incorporate and establish close links with SRB activities in the area and to establish continuous information flows with other schemes.

The Capacity Building programme was managed by the Community Development Unit of Bristol City Council, who were based in the URBAN I area to allow for maximum accessibility. It was seen as essential to the successful implementation of the Business Plan to have a Community Development Worker employed providing continuity and an identifiable role within the local community. The Community Development Worker worked alongside the URBAN programme manager. This combination of posts proved to be very successful and, considering the technical and managerial effort required by URBAN, a necessary intervention.

At the outset of URBAN, it was recognised that community groups in the URBAN area were at different levels of capacity and awareness regarding project development and networking. A lot of small community groups existed, but very few with capacities to access available resources. Thereupon, the following needs were addressed in the Business Plan:

- A sense of powerlessness and a lack of ownership from local people;
- Lack of skills building within the community;
- Building trust within the local community;
- Existence of multiple barriers to training and employment activity (language, childcare responsibilities, lack of training and experience, lack of recognised qualifications);
- Lack of engagement of locally based voluntary organisations in the regeneration process.

To respond to the above issues, a wide range of capacity building actions were incorporated combining area-wide activities, including awareness raising and access to training, with targeted

support for specific minority groups and community organisations. A further level of intervention was created by establishing a Project Development Fund for local community groups.

The following capacity building actions were incorporated in the plan:

- Information (News-sheet, Resources Book);
- Training (Community Action, Community Enterprise, Funding, Mentoring);
- Resources (Project Development Fund);
- Advice and Project Support (Community Development Worker, Volunteer Support);
- Targeted Support (Asian Women, Refugees, Bangladeshi and African Caribbean Women);
- Local Ownership (Local Community Partnerships).

The intention was to delegate and employ locally, in order to increase levels of ownership and programme awareness. Training was, therefore, sourced locally, and voluntary organisations, based in the area, were commissioned to undertake various elements of the plan, for example the 'Resource Book'.

After one year of implementation, the Business Plan was on target and key successes were achieved. Other features of the Bristol URBAN I Programme singled out for praise in the Interim Evaluation were:

Bristol City Council, as one example of good practice, introduced up-front funding after a period of slow development in community based project applications. It was agreed with the UPG to base the individual permission for up-front funding on a case by case basis, according to identified needs and requirements claimed by the applicant organisation.

#### **Other Evaluation**

There was no requirement for a formal evaluation of the Bristol URBAN I programme. However, a report to Bristol City Council as the Accountable Body was made in October 1999. The report to the Regeneration Joint Sub Committee and to the Equalities and Social Justice Committee indicated that:

- There was a need to simplify processes and procedures as far as possible;
- The importance of developing strategy/Action Plan at the outset, rather than individual project applications at too early a stage;
- The importance of joint management of funding streams (e.g the Key Fund);
- Standard protocols on accountability are developed;
- Recognition of the long lead times in programme and project implementation;
- The need for long term and sustained support;
- The need for dedicated financial support to bidding, managing and monitoring regeneration resources
- Adequate funding of programme management; and
- Better working relationships between BCC and GOSW/RDA.

#### **Summary**

Many of the points raised by the Interim Evaluation and the local report to Bristol City Council were addressed during the course of the Programme Implementation. The Bristol URBAN I Programme was singled out for praise in a number of aspects, in particular the help provided to applicants at the application stage, and in the extent of capacity building offered to local groups. Undoubtedly these two factors contributed to the high levels of committed expenditure in the Bristol URBAN I Programme.

## **E     CONTROL ACTIVITY**

Financial and output monitoring at the project level was also conducted by the Government Office for the South West, and the Programme was subject to an ERDF and ESF audit carried out by Government Office.

The auditors report commented:

- Monitoring activity by the applicant (Bristol City Council) had improved as a result of earlier auditor's concerns;
- That particular attention should be paid to internal charges and apportionment to ensure that these are based on a sound rationale;
- That the applicant should ensure that all claims are based on actual expenditure, although accruals were regarded as very small and insufficient to require claims to be revised.

## **ANNEX A MONITORING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

The following represents the initial membership of the PMC (December 1997).

<b><u>Representative</u></b>	<b><u>Organisation</u></b>
Matthew Quinn	Government Office for the South West (Chair)
Peter Berkowitz	European Commission
Councillor Robin Moss	Bristol City Council
Helen Ball	Bristol City Council
Balraj Sandhu	Bristol Black Voluntary Sector Development Unit
Supt. David Warren	Avon and Somerset Constabulary
Louise Williams	WESTEC
Kate Orchard	Avon Health Authority
Sandra Hays	Voluntary Organisations Standing Conference on Urban Regeneration (VOSCUR)
Roger Vaughan	Government Office for the South West (Secretariat)
<b><u>Observers</u></b>	
Lucy de Groot	Bristol City Council
Anna Schiff	Bristol Regeneration Partnership
Denise Jones	Government Office for the South West (Secretariat)
Steve Morris	Government Office for the South West (Secretariat)

The membership of the PMC changed considerably during the course of URBAN I Programme implementation. The PMC as of June 1999 was as follows:

Bryony Holden	Government Office for the South West (Chair)
Ewan Clark	Learning Partnerships West
Peter Courtier	Bristol Council for Racial Equality
Asher Craig	Black Development Agency (deputy: Balraj Sandhu)
Mark Gallagher	European Commission
Councillor Helen Holland	Bristol City Council (alternating with Helen Ball)
Chris Minett	Employment Service (New Deal Team)
Steve Morris	Government Office for the South West (Secretariat)
Councillor Robin Moss	Bristol City Council
Kate Orchard	Avon Health Authority
Richard Read	Avon and Somerset Constabulary
Martin Sandbrook	WESTEC
Murray Stewart	University of the West of England
Helena Taggart	VOSCUR
Mark Ziedler	Bristol Chamber of Commerce

## **ANNEX B    URBAN PARTNERSHIP GROUP**

### **Representative**

Cllr Robin Moss, Chair

Cllr Helen Holland  
Cllr John Channon

Chris Minett  
Fred Semple  
Louise Williams  
Jonathan Morris  
Alfredo Vasquez  
Balraj Sandhu  
Bob Lewis  
Wendy Stevenson  
Abu Sheriff

### **Organisation**

Bristol City Council

Bristol City Council  
Bristol City Council  
Bristol Regeneration Partnership  
Employment Service  
Bristol Housing Partnership  
WESTEC  
WESTEC  
Ashley Community Forum  
Black Development Agency  
Barton Hill Statement  
VOSCUR  
Local Resident  
Bristol URBAN Traders Partnership

**ANNEX C APPROVED PROJECTS**

Project	Sponsor	ERDF	Total Cost	%
<b>Measure 1</b>				
Bristol Foyer	Knightstone Housing Association	300,000	945,299	32%
Bristol East Side Trading	Bristol URBAN Traders Partnership	510,100	1,012,440	47%
Barton Hill IT	Barton Hill Workshops	28,804	62,804	45%
Growing Together	BCC Leisure Services	198,000	396,000	50%
Sofa 2000	BCC	405,789*	971,736	42%
URBAN Disabled Access Improvements	BCC Equalities Unit	11,900	23,800	50%
Easton Business Centre Extension	East Bristol Enterprises	300,000	741,104	45%
Capacity Building of Ethnic Minority Businesses	CEED	40,392	89,760	45%
<b>Measure 2</b>				
Capacity Building 1 (Plan)	BCC Community Development Unit	4,817	11,920	40%
Capacity Building 2 (Delivery)	BCC Community Development Unit	99,940	211,263	47%
Project Development Worker	BCC	61,010	129,884	47%
Participation and Awareness Project	BCC	110,243	220,485	50%
Black URBAN Development	Black Development Agency	98,495	236,495	42%
<b>Measure 3 (ESF)</b>				
FastTrack Trainee Support	Westmoreland Development Trust (FastTrack Trust Ltd)	74,078	206,580	36%
Neighbourhood Home Maintenance & Training Scheme	Care & Repair Ltd	88,248	196,105	45%
Barton Hill IT	Barton Hill Workshops	33,554	80,591	42%
Growing Together	BCC Leisure Services	172,800	384,000	45%
Positive Action Partnership Scheme	West of England Centre for Integrated Living	4,466	9,925	45%
New Deal Trinity	Scout Enterprises (Western) Ltd	40,000	95,000	42%
Bristol URBAN Outreach	On-site Bristol	36,246	80,619	45%
Awaz Utaoh	Employment Links	41,325	91,325	45%
Southmead Development Trust	Southmead Development Trust	26,892	59,760	45%
FastTrack 2	FastTrack 2	24,194	57,298	42%
YoungMothers Training Course	Bristol Community Education	12,922	28,820	45%
Pathways to Work	Western Partnership for Sustainable Development	117,314	260,695	45%
Capacity Building 3	Citizens Advice Bureau	6,444	12,867	50%
<b>Measure 4</b>				
Bristol URBAN Key Fund	Greater Bristol Foundation	67,500	134,500	50%
<i>Interim Evaluation – costs covered by DETR and European Commission</i>				

\*includes 5,798 reallocated from Foyer

## **Annex D: PMC Terms of Reference**

### **EUROPEAN COMMUNITY INITIATIVE URBAN**

### **BRISTOL**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **PROGRAMME MONITORING COMMITTEE**

The **Programme Monitoring Committee** (PMC) is to be established under Article 25 of Council Regulation (EC) 2082/93. References to the role of the PMC are also contained in the Programme Document, C(97) 2209, dated 28 July 1997., page 27 et. seq.

In particular, the PMC will have the following objectives, tasks and working practices:

### **OBJECTIVES**

To ensure the satisfactory progress of the programme in order to achieve the objectives laid down in the Decision of the European Communities dated 28 July 1997.

### **TASKS**

1. To ensure compliance with regulatory provisions, including those related to the eligibility of measures and projects
2. To ensure conformity of the measures with the priorities selected and the objectives foreseen;
3. To ensure compliance with other Community Policies
4. To ensure co-ordination between assistance from the Funds and assistance granted by other grant and loan instruments of the Community and other public funds.
5. To lay down provision for the effective implementation of the measures. It is regularly informed about the description, progress, and outcomes of individual projects submitted for Community assistance. In the case of major projects, the Committee ensures that where appropriate, the information required under Article 5 of Regulation (EEC) no 4254/88 (the ERDF Regulation) is supplied to the Commission.
6. To monitor, organize and examine the work on interim evaluation of the operation.
7. To propose any steps required to speed up the programme where delays are apparent.
8. To prepare and deliberate upon any proposals to amend the operation in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Programme Document, p28, para 5.
9. To oversee promotion and publicity for the operation in accordance with Commission Decision no 94/342/CE of 31 May 1994.

## **WORKING PRACTICES**

The Committee shall normally meet at six monthly intervals.

The Member State or Commission may require a meeting to be held at any other time. The Chair will have the power to convene a meeting at short notice in the event of urgent business.

The business of the Committee shall be conducted on the principle of consensus. In the event of a dispute, the Chair shall act as mediator.

Membership of the Committee shall consist of the organisations and individuals named below. A quorum of the PMC shall consist of not less than 50% of its members, and must include the Chair.

Members will declare any interest, personal or financial, which they might have in any project for consideration, and will take no part in the consideration or discussion of any project in which they have such an interest.

## **MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROGRAMME MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES**

Commission of the European Communities  
Government Office for the South West (Chair + 1)  
Bristol City Council (2)  
Bristol Black Voluntary Sector Development Unit  
Voluntary Sector Standing Conference on Urban Regeneration  
Bristol Chamber of Commerce and Initiative  
Learning Partnerships South West  
WESTEC  
Avon and Somerset Constabulary  
Avon Health Trust  
University of the West of England  
Bristol Council for Racial Equality  
Solon Housing Association  
Bristol College of Higher Education  
Employment Service

2 representatives from residential/local community groups to be invited as capacity develops

16/06/05